

**UTAH CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMISSION
ON
CHEMICAL WEAPONS DEMILITARIZATION**

**Thursday, January 16, 2003
Division of Environmental Quality
6:00 p.m.-8:30 p.m.**

Those in attendance:

Gene White (GW)
Beverly White (BW)
Jane Bowman (JB)
Deborah Kim (DK)
Rosemary Holt (RH)
Geoff Silcox (GS)
David Ostler (DO)
Dennis Downs (DD)
Michael Keene (MK)
Dan Bauer (DB)

Members absent:

John Bennett

1. Welcome/Minutes – Deborah Kim

Debbie Kim called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. The minutes were approved as written with one minor change; Beverly White was not in attendance at the last meeting. Motion to accept minutes made by Dr. Jane Bowman, second by Geoff Silcox. All in favor.

2. Follow-up items:

a. Update from the Environmental Forum – Portland OR – Deborah Kim

This was a meeting to see how other commissions work and how regulators work. Environmental and regulatory issues were discussed which impact each of the storage sites. It was apparent that we have been at this a lot longer than others. This was a very informative meeting. There was a lot of debate about the incident this summer in Tooele. Marty Gray was in attendance and Utah was very well represented.

3. Deseret Chemical Depot Update – Colonel Cooper. A handout was provided.

No leakers since last CAC meeting. The only agent burn going on right now is Mustard sampling at CAMDS in order to characterize the agent which is by taking samples of liquid, sludge and solid along the edge of the one ton containers. The valves on the ton containers are frozen shut which posed a problem because they could not be vented. There is an alternate method to vent off the hydrogen to that is being tried now. The restart is scheduled for January 21, 2003. Preparations are beginning for systemization of the Lewissite facilities.

There was one event since last meeting from the Projectile Washout System, which is an ACWA program. This technology will be used at the Pueblo facility, and will wash the mustard out of the rounds and neutralize the agent. Four personnel were present when the agent was detected and had no signs of agent exposure. The apparent cause was the ventilation system in the chemical treatment facility with too much traffic. Corrective actions have been put in place to alleviate this problem.

Q-DO-The reason we have no leakers now is because they have all been burned?

A-The biggest reason is because of the temperatures. Leakers are usually found when the temperatures vary from hot to cold or cold to hot.

Q-JG-You showed the 10 TWA for 27 minutes and the 6.83 TWA at 39 minutes

A-Remember, the personnel were evacuated immediately. It took a while to find the problem.

JG-Did any employees miss work or get reassigned?

A-No

4. Plant Status/Restart Update – Tom Kurkky. A handout was provided.

Mr. Kurkky discussed the safety improvement plan. He broke it down into completed items and items to be completed. A new procedure of work planning scheduling and documentation procedures has been implemented. Work crew work order preparation training, established guidelines for shift turnovers and initiated a weekly restart newsletter to all employees. Other items include shift roles and responsibility, independent reviews of all engineering modifications since 07/15/02. Developed long-term care program for exposed workers, modified and trained incident response protocols and procedures, completed training of monitoring leads on RTAPS monitoring instruments. Several other items were completed regarding safety improvement including receiving input from the individuals involved in the incident, implemented toxic area entry requirements, safety based employee concern program, a new database for lessons learned, revised medical assistance and decontamination procedures and revised the limiting conditions of operations for electrical and HVAC systems. Activities yet to be completed include the installation of LIC air purge line modification, spent decontamination system strainers, training the employees on the Site Contractor Lessons Learned database, preventative maintenance and instrument calibrations due in near future, ACAMS set point modification, deactivation furnace system (DFS) outage work.

Start up milestones-

1/27/03 – Operational Readiness Review

2/12/03 – EG & G ORR & Findings Complete

2/13/03 – EG & G letter submittal to PMCD for restart

6/30/03 – Self-Assessment

Q-RH-Who conducts the ORR?

A-It is an EG & G self ready assessment team, chaired by corporate Risk Manager.

Q-GS- When do the trial burns begin?

A-Once all permits approved etc., then we will start “shake down” up to 720 hours that we can verify all operations and allows tests to be completed to determine speed rates.

Q-GS-What is the set point for modifications on the ACAMS, does the set point go up or down?

A-The set point is .5 TWA

Q-GS-The strainers? Why straining?

A-The munitions have been stored in the igloos and dirt is on the munitions so the strainers prevent that material into the tanks. The dirt poses a real challenge to clean, this is to remedy that issue.

Q-RH-Did you have any procedure for the long term care for exposed workers before?

A-No, we did not. We developed the procedure from the lessons learned.

AGENDA ITEM-Invite McTravers to discuss sleep disorders associated with rotating shift work and provide us an overview of the new medical guidelines and procedures.

DK- Comment – I had the opportunity to review the report about safety improvements on behalf of the CAC. A non-disclosure statement was required and cannot discuss the report, but all the improvement plans are part of the report and reflecting the major areas of concern. My questions have been satisfied.

GW- At the attendance of the Environmental Forum conference is that all things have been improved drastically. In particular interest was the decontamination process with a reference card and they are available in the units.

Q-DK-Will there be any monitoring for residual GB?

A-Yes-60 GB monitors. We will be processing GB secondary waste at the same time. They are labeled accordingly.

Q-JG-Talked about getting more information to the employees, will they have access to the investigation report? As well as the conclusions and corrective actions?

A-They will have the opportunity to read the EG& G report

Q-JG-Is that available to the public?

A-That is typically given to the state, but do not publish it.

Q-JG-Can a copy be provided to the state?

A-Our report or the Army report? (EG& G) PMCD has not released the report to the state yet.

Q-JG-Can this be requested to have available at the main office?

A- The Army report, No, we cannot get. We can request the in house EG& G Report and conclusions will not fall into the army rules and will be available to

the public, unless there is some rule I do not know about (Ted Ryba). If one wants a copy of the report, this can be pursued with EG& G.

Q-JG-Will the Army provide a copy of the report to the employees

A-No, the position of the Army report has not changed. It is an internal report and will not be released to the public.

DK-You still would like access to the report, correct? (Yes) My understanding is that it is still under Army regulations, particular code, restricts who can see the report, Dr. Fiori is looking to change it under a certain code, but still at this point, it is not available.

Q-JG-How are we to know that all corrective actions have been taken?

A-DK- I ask that you believe me that what you see here is everything and more reflecting the key issues and shortcomings and then some of what was in the report. I can assure you that after reviewing the report things are satisfied, I am satisfied and I asked a lot of questions when reviewing the document.

Comment-JG-I don't know if that does satisfy things. Because it is looking at the overall process, I think that is weak by the Army.

DK-My understanding about the regulation that the investigation was performed under, covers other departments of the Army and other types of safety events that may occur within the framework of the Army. This is a broad based regulation, to allow for free reporting of information without fear of retaliation and to protect the people involved.

5. Program Status

a. Annual Report/Update – Ted Ryba, TOCDF Deputy Project Manager. A handout was provided

Ted Ryba discussed the Annual Status report of 2002 and what to expect during 2003. A safety improvement program was initiated as was the VX campaign. Due to exposure incident in July, the safety improvement program was sped up for implementation before the VX campaign could continue. The schedule that was provided is what TOCDF is tracked with at the highest level. He also showed a new draft schedule for 2003. This also showed what to expect at the facility and an expected closure date, two years prior to what TOCDF is being tracked against at the Dept. of the Army. The assumptions used in determining the VX schedule include the issue with the Metal Parts Furnace (MPF) without impacting current throughput rate.

Q-GS-It doesn't show in the schedule time for processing secondary waste, is this in there?

A-We don't consider processing secondary waste as a separate campaign. We will pass the waste through the MPF as it is available.

Q-JG-There was discussion of possibly extending the 720 hours of the shakedown period; the schedule shows that you will have finished the VX rocket campaign before you finish a trial burn? Is this correct?

A-That is one way to read it, there are other items here that are not noted on the schedule that will not allow that to happen. Under the regulations that we have in place with the EPA, we have a number of rockets that we are allowed to process

prior to the demonstration burn and there is a limitation to the number we can process prior to the trial burn

Q-How far can you get through the rocket stockpile before you hit that limit?

A-We have an agreement that we will run our trial burn and have enough rockets to shakedown and run 3-4 runs and have enough left over and not be done with the VX rockets.

Q-At that point, you will finish the rockets before you have any of the data back or submit it to the state for approval or will you stop at your trial burn and wait for approval?

A-That is probably a correct statement

Q-So it that appropriate way to allow for the incineration of the stockpile to go about?

A-It is legally allowed and as long as we feel it is safe we will allow it.

Q-How would you know?

A-We do get preliminary data immediately and if we see any problem we then we take a look at the trial burn and decide if we certify that or if we have to do it again. The data has a 100% rate and then go to 50% rate. There is safety built in to it.

b. Site Status Report – Monte Caldwell, TOCDF Deputy Project Manager. A handout was provided

There is a correction to the handout. On page 5 under the Pueblo Chemical Agent Disposal Facility in Colorado the contract that was awarded to Bechtel, should read \$1.5 Billion instead of \$1.5 million. Marty Gray was at JACADs recently and it is basically an empty shell because it is due for closure in January '04. There is concern about the amount of water that is being used at Pueblo; this troubles the local farmers.

Q-DO-What quantities of water are we talking about?

A-20 gallons of water to 1 gallon of agent. This process takes a considerable amount more water than incineration. The neutralized agent has to be shipped off for bio-breakdown. They may be building their own bioremediation on-site, which could contribute to the water issue as well.

Q-Jane Bowman-I thought I saw that Bluegrass has chosen their technology, is that correct?

A-No that is not. They had several technology briefings from several types, but that has not been committed. They identified that neutralization was a preferred alternative in the list of alternatives.

6. **DSHW Update – Marty Gray.** There was not a handout provided. Marty indicated that the Risk Assessment is available on the website. The reports themselves along with the public comments and responses as well. There are three modifications that we are working on monitoring plans, site work and safety improvement process. The only site work that is going on right now is the safety improvement that is being conducted there we have been following the progress

and watching as EG & G goes through the process. Few items we are tracking ourselves and should get through those fairly quickly. With the mustard sampling that is taking place at CAMDS, we plan to watch that process to see the samples that are being taken; we will have a higher degree of confidence.

MK- Do you see any potential discrepancies between the timeline and what is considered to be rational?

A-I don't see any issues that we are dealing with that will impact the timeline.

RH-You mentioned some things that your division would like to have something changed or added - is this anything that we would be interested in? (Regarding the safety improvement plan)

A-There are four areas that rather than follow what the committee is doing, we chose to look at, the preventative maintenance, engineering, training and monitoring. They are not very different, just a different perspective as environmental regulators.

7. **Restoration Advisory Board – Walt Levi.** A handout was provided. The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) was designed to allow the community to give input for the restoration of contaminated areas at the depot. The restoration program does not include closure of “permitted” entities i.e. TOCDF or CAMDS. The meetings are held every three to four months at the Tooele Outreach Office. The next meeting is March 11, 2003, at 5:30 p.m.

8. **Citizens Concerns**

9. **Adjourn.** The next meeting will be March 20, 2003 at Tooele City Hall beginning at 6:30 p.m.